

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P803807/WO/1	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/010447	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 17 September 2004 (17.09.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 16 October 2003 (16.10.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant DAIMLERCHRYSLER AG		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																								
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 40%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Date of issuance of this report 27 July 2006 (27.07.2006) Authorized officer <p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Agnes Wittmann-Regis</p> e-mail: pt06@wipo.int
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

Translation

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	See Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)
-------------------------------------	---

Applicant's or agent's file reference

P803807/WO/1

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/010447

International filing date (day/month/year)

17.09.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

16.10.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

B62D25/04

Applicant

DAIMLERCHRYSLER AG

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/010447

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language

_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐

a sequence listing

☐

table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐

in written format

☐

in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐

contained in the international application as filed.

☐

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/010447

Box No. II

Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not yet been furnished:
- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
 - ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).
- Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date in the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/010447

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>4-7</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-3</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims _____	YES
	Claims <u>1-7</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-7</u>	YES
	Claims _____	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE 10125985 A

D2: EP 1138581 A

D3: DE 10149244 A

2 With regard to claim 1, D1 discloses an A-pillar (1) of a motor vehicle, which has a windscreen flange (2) for the securing of a windscreen (3), the A-pillar (1) being of one-piece design in the region of the windscreen (3) and a wall region forming the windscreen flange (2) bounding a hollow cross section of the A-pillar (1) (figure 2).

D1 therefore discloses all of the features of claim 1.

2.1 With regard to claim 2, D1 furthermore discloses that the windscreen flange (2) is formed by an indentation (figure 2) in the hollow cross section of the A-pillar (1).

The subject matter of claim 2 in combination is therefore also anticipated by D1.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/010447

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
	<p data-bbox="342 344 1305 512">2.2 With regard to claim 3, D1 furthermore shows that the windscreen flange (2) is entirely formed by an indentation in the hollow cross section of the A-pillar (1) (figure 2).</p> <p data-bbox="428 575 1235 648">Consequently, the subject matter of claim 3 in combination is not novel either.</p> <p data-bbox="342 711 1341 879">3. Dependent claims 4 to 7 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the PCT requirements for inventive step. The reasons are as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="342 942 1341 1467">3.1 In D1, the A-pillar is an internal high pressure component. By contrast, all of the features of claims 4 to 7 for producing, for example, an A-pillar (claim 10) are known from D2 (see claims 1 to 3 and 9). The use of cast steel in the construction of vehicle bodies, as shown, for example, in D2, is adequately known to a person skilled in the art. Its use in D1 would not therefore constitute an inventive hurdle for a person skilled in the art, particularly since the consequences are readily foreseeable and no surprising technical effect is associated with them.</p> <p data-bbox="342 1530 1325 1688">4 Finally, for the sake of completeness, it should be pointed out that D3 must likewise be considered as prejudicial to the novelty of claims 1 to 4, 5 and 6.</p>